DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 443 305 HE 033 059

AUTHOR	Fincher, Cameron
TITLE	Cooperative Strategies in Administrative Leadership.
INSTITUTION	Georgia Univ., Athens. Inst. of Higher Education.
PUB DATE	1992-09-00
NOTE	20p.; Paper presented at the Annual European Association for Institutional Research Forum on Institutional Research (14th, Brussels, Belgium, September 6-9, 1992).
AVAILABLE FROM	Institute of Higher Education, Candler Hall, University of Georgia, Athens, GA 30602-1772; Tel: 706-542-3464.
PUB TYPE	Opinion Papers (120) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Administration; College Presidents; Continuing Education; Higher Education; Inservice Education; *Institutional Cooperation; International Cooperation; *Leadership Training; Management Development; *Professional Development; Professional Training; Seminars

ABSTRACT

This paper argues that meeting the challenges and opportunities of the 21st century will require significant changes in organizational and institutional leadership, and that universities worldwide must accept greater responsibility for the training and development of administrative leaders. Universities must develop cooperative strategies and programs that appreciate common problems, issues, and concerns, since the effectiveness of administrative leadership is increasingly dependent on forms of inter-institutional and cross-cultural cooperation that are crucial to the effectiveness and vitality of universities as leading institutions in western civilization. In the United States, recruitment, selection, and appointment of administrative leaders is costly and time-consuming, and the process can appear capricious and whimsical. Policies under which administrative leaders are appointed and premises upon which they are recruited and selected are often contradictory. The training and development of institutional leaders is also left to others. A great variety and abundance of leadership development programs is available; instructional strategies for educating and developing administrative leaders include: inservice development programs, administrative development seminars, administrative team leadership, continuing professional education, and intercultural cooperation. Cooperation among universities and other higher education institutions is essential to solving educational problems that impede the U.S. cultural and technological advancement. (Contains 15 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 443 305

COOPERATIVE STRATEGIES IN ADMINISTRATIVE LEADERSHIP

Cameron Fincher

University of Georgia
Institute of Higher Education
Athens, GA 30602-1772

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
C. Fincher
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This paper was presented at the 14th Annual EAIR Forum on Institutional Research at the Vrije Universiteit Brussel in Brussels, Belgium, September 6-9, 1992.

Copyright © 1992 by the Institute of Higher Education,
The University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia 30602-1772

COOPERATIVE STRATEGIES IN ADMINISTRATIVE LEADERSHIP

The education and development of administrative leaders give European and American universities a remarkable opportunity for interinstitutional and intercultural cooperation. Numerous precedents for international cooperation can be found in research and scholarly disciplines that are common to contemporary universities. The experiences of American universities in management education offer advice and counsel to administrative development programs that focus on the technological, international, and cross-cultural issues with which future leaders must cope (Porter and McKibbin, 1988). However, the administrative and organizational structures that have served so well in the past must be re-examined in the light of rapid cultural and technological change (See Fincher, 1991).

The challenges and opportunities of the 21st century will require, no doubt, significant changes in organizational and institutional leadership. The future chief executive officer of multinational corporations has been described as a master strategist and a highly effective communicator (Korn/Ferry, 1990). Some observers suggest that future leaders must be able to inspire a shared vision, empower others to act, serve as a model, exude self-confidence, express the hopes of others, and sustain a high level of energetic activity (Kouzes and Posner, 1989; Conger et al., 1988). Other writers call for business leaders who have taken "an oath of inner greatness" (Koestenbaum, 1991) or seek a restructuring of societal organizations (Bolman and Deal, 1991).

The future leaders of multinational universities will need more tangible forms of knowledge and competence. The size and complexity of higher education call for conceptual abilities, interpersonal competencies, and technical skills in which many institutional leaders are currently deficient. The changing roles and responsibilities of administrative leaders require better preparation, more inservice opportunities to acquire knowledge and experience, and appropriate ways to continue their own professional education. All such efforts call for instructional, training, and developmental resources that improve administrative performance.

In brief, universities everywhere must accept greater responsibility for the education of their own leaders. In meeting the challenge of training and developing administrative leaders, universities must develop cooperative strategies and programs that are appreciative of common problems, issues, and concerns. In turn, the effectiveness of administrative leadership is increasingly dependent upon forms of interinstitutional and cross-cultural cooperation that are crucial to the effectiveness *and* vitality of universities as leading institutions in western civilization.

Patterns and Premises

In the U.S. the recruitment, selection, and appointment of administrative leaders is a costly and time-consuming process. Many institutions take a year or more to identify and screen candidates, to interview and assess the front-runners, and to negotiate the amenities and conditions of employment. To many observers the overall process is capricious and whimsical. The policies under which administrative leaders are appointed and the premises upon which they are recruited and selected are often contradictory. More often than expected, an unknown candidate will be chosen because he or she has escaped censure or veto by any one of the numerous naysayers who participate in the process. Thus no one should be surprised when mediocrity — instead of cream — rises to the top.

Institutional policies for appointment are subject to sunshine laws, affirmative action plans, and various commitments to equity and excellence, as the latter two principles have been debated since the 1960s. The premises of recruitment and selection, nonetheless, are another matter. One unspoken premise is the foolish notion that universities must never know who their next president will be. Many policy and decision makers are skeptical of the previous training and experience potential presidents obtain in their own institutions, and preference is given to presidents who have been prepared by others. Some universities do not hesitate to hire the presidents of other institutions; many universities have a fondness for the second-in-command (vice presidents) at peer institutions that are a bit more prestigious. Indeed, institutional pecking-orders are quite visible in the recruitment and selection of administrative leaders at all levels. As difficult as it is to pick the winning candidate in an elaborate search, screening, and selection process, it is quite easy to identify institutions,

academic disciplines, and professional specialities from which a new president is *not* likely to come.

Despite tendencies to shroud presidential appointments in mystery, the career patterns of administrative leaders are increasingly visible in American higher education. Academic administration is very much a career, and no president, vice president, or dean is likely to be plucked meritoriously from faculty ranks. A traditional pattern of rising from department head to academic dean to president has been altered by the added layers of administration evident in vice presidents and division heads. As a result, the careers of some presidents begin somewhere in the middle of administrative hierarchies, and others begin in staff positions such as assistant or associate deans (Moore, 1988). Outside academic channels, it has been possible for some presidents to take "an organizational route" to the university presidency. National associations housed in Washington can provide a springboard for staff members and for others who have served well in organizational ranks. And of course, as the states of New Jersey and Tennessee prove, gubernatorial and congressional offices are not disadvantageous in presidential appointments.

Training and Development

Given the reluctance of American universities to prepare their own administrative leaders, it is not surprising that the training and development of institutional leaders is left to others. A great variety of leadership development programs is offered by national associations, professional societies, statewide systems, and other educational organizations. Most of these programs, courses, and projects have been influenced by executive and management development efforts in American business corporations. And for a while, they were fostered by federal programs of assistance to institutions of higher education. Most programs are affected, no doubt, by the short tenure of college presidents (an average of seven years) and by the continuing addition of administrative agencies on many university campuses.

The training and developmental opportunities available to academic administrators in the U.S. have been summarized (in commendable detail) by Madeleine Green and Sharon McDade (1991). Included in such efforts are national institutes, such as the Harvard Institute for Educational Management; internships and fellowships, such as the American

Council on Education's Fellows Program; and innumerable seminars and workshops running from one day to two weeks. Other short-term courses are available on university campuses throughout the academic year and especially during the summer term. The strengths of such efforts are few but encouraging; the weaknesses are many and often unrecognized.

The objectives and content of training seminars, conferences, workshops, and short-term courses display an impressive concern with leadership styles and techniques. Unfortunately, many training and development programs concentrate unduly on techniques that are perceived as quick-and-easy fixes for operational problems. Too many programs deal with faddish topics such as strategic planning, time management, mentoring, networking, negotiating, team building and fund-raising. Instead of substantive concepts, principles, and issues, many programs and courses offer a delightful menu of aphorisms and anecdotes — all of them taught in an engaging manner. In many workshops and short-term courses there is an excessive concern with symbolic leadership, as opposed to substantive leadership. Equally often, workshops and seminars of this kind are conducted *without* adequate preparation by participants and *without* systematic evaluation.

The abundance of training and developmental programs leaves unanswered the question of their utility for the improvement of administrative leadership in U.S. colleges and universities. Some programs, such as the ACE Fellowships, are quite successful in placing their participants in administrative positions. There is no doubt that many well qualified administrative leaders have been identified through the ACE program, but a healthy skepticism is well advised. The prestige of ACE and the reputation of mentors could account for the successful placement of many ACE Fellows. The remaining variance could be explained by the individual differences of participants — with no significant variance being accounted for by the substance, content, or quality of the inservice experiences of the participants. Such skepticism is in order for virtually all workshops lasting no more than a week, for training seminars lacking preparation and evaluation, and for short-term courses taught on the run by outside consultants. In industry and business there is better evidence of effectiveness in management training and

development, but even there the evidence is not as compelling as training consultants would hope (See Bass, 1990).

Taking all the limitations of administrative training and development in the U.S. and considering the unplanned pathways in administrative careers, much can still be learned from the study of administrative leadership in American colleges and universities. The contemporary research/graduate/land grant university in the U.S. is an extraordinary accomplishment in the 20th century — and the administrative leadership of such universities has many distinctive and effective features that are worthy of emulation by others.

Interinstitutional Cooperation

In the U.S. cooperation among universities and other institutions of higher education is essential to the solution of educational problems that impede the nation's cultural and technological advancement. The curricular and instructional effectiveness of four-year colleges must be improved to ensure a more adequate flow of capable students to professional and graduate programs. Leadership and assistance must be given to community colleges and secondary schools in the preparation of students moving from the lower levels of education. And among the various levels of peer institutions, cooperative efforts must ensure that competitiveness does not squander public resources that are obviously limited. All such forms of cooperation require enlightened and highly capable leadership.

Cooperative programs among universities are significantly improved when they make constructive use of each other's experience in the professional development of administrative leaders. Leading universities, in particular, should make better use of conferences, seminars, internships, visiting lecturers, intercampus consultation, and innovative case studies of administrative and institutional effectiveness. All such efforts should involve, whenever possible, the exchange of talents and expertise that are relevant to the improved status and functions of universities as institutions of higher learning. Cooperative strategies, programs, and services should be developed within a context of cultural and technological change — and with appreciation of national needs for international cooperation in a global environment.

Instructional Strategies

There are many ways in which universities can cooperate in the education and development of administrative leaders. Institutional resources and talents can be coalesced effectively at several levels of administrative responsibility for mutual benefits and advantages. Several useful patterns of interinstitutional cooperation in administrative development may be seen in the various conferences, seminars, and workshops conducted by the Institute of Higher Education at the University of Georgia since 1964. Various instructional efforts have been directed to the inservice development of currently appointed administrators and to the continuing professional education of presidents, vice presidents, deans, directors, and department heads. The effectiveness of administrative conferences, seminars, and workshops has varied with institutional participants and purposes, with the level of funding for many programs, and with the quality of planning and preparation given each program.

Inservice Development

When several institutions can cooperate in the orientation of newly appointed administrators, the combined effect can be appreciable. Intercampus visits can be arranged for small groups of administrators to confer with experienced colleagues and to discuss common duties and responsibilities. The advantages of such visits range from the more comprehensive view each participant will obtain to their opportunity to raise naive questions in a friendly environment. Such advantages are improved by having at least two recent appointees meet with the same host administrator. In such ways, they can learn from each other as well as from their host. Further advantages can be gained by the coordination of a "third party" who will participate in each visit and provide a "sounding board" for later questions or reactions. The Institute of Higher Education has served well as a coordinating agency for institutions participating in programs for newly appointed administrators. Many capable administrators are quite willing to serve as hosts for colleagues from other campuses, and the mutual benefits of intercampus visits are quite evident from the later evaluations of participants.

Administrative internships have been a prominent and effective feature of most doctoral programs in higher education. Graduate students, upon completion of their formal coursework, serve for a quarter, semester, or academic year under the supervision of experienced administrators on other campuses. In such ways, students of administration are given a more practical view of policy decisions and administrative actions. Unfortunately, the effectiveness of internships is much too dependent upon the personal qualifications of administrators agreeing to supervise interns — and the professional interests of staff members who coordinate internships at cooperating institutions. From the vantage point of 1992, administrative internships should not be recommended as a highly effective method of instruction and development for potential or newly appointed administrators. Graduate students apparently enjoy their participation in internships, but many supervising administrators do not (or cannot) involve student interns in administrative decision making or problem solving. At the other end of the continuum, some supervising administrators will take their responsibilities too seriously and overinstruct. Thus, the effectiveness of an administrative internship is greatly dependent upon requirements which too many internships lack.

Administrative Development Seminars

Interinstitutional cooperation in the planning and implementation of administrative development seminars offer many imaginative and innovative possibilities — and numerous benefits to both participants and institutions. Well organized seminars for experienced administrators should be worthy of graduate credit, and each should be developed within a framework of inservice development or continuing professional education. Essential to such seminars are a well prepared syllabus or course outline; clearly stated objectives, procedures, and expected outcomes; well chosen background materials or assigned readings; and explicit guidance or direction in postseminar uses and applications. Active participation in the seminar thereby can be facilitated by advance preparation and open discussion of the ideas, issues, or principles introduced for deliberation.

Additional benefits can be gained by involving participants from other institutions as lecturers, discussion leaders, or consultants. For full

benefits, however, such seminars need a flexible schedule, a well prepared agenda, advance preparation, and consistent leadership. Also essential to such efforts would be some kind of assessment in the form of a written plan, proposal, position paper, journal article, or "think piece" that would stem from seminar discussions and the critical thinking each should require.

Several advantages should be evident from the participation of administrators from three or more institutions. Group discussions would not bog down in politics or personalities that are peculiar to one institution. A focus on common issues or general problems would be encouraged, and a broader perspective on administrative concepts and principles should be an important outcome. Once again, the advantages of "a third party" to serve as navigator should be evident in the seminar's direction and momentum. The effectiveness of seminars depends, of course, on the efforts of participants — and the extent to which personal and institutional incentives are called into play.

As a cooperative strategy, administrative workshops can be designed as a subset of seminars in which closer attention is given to special or particular issues, topics, and problems. To be effective in the long-run, all workshops should have experienced discussion leaders, should involve well prepared reference materials — and should require some kind of follow-through in the form of a written report, journal article, proposed plan, or critical assessment of outcomes.

Administrative Team Leadership

A special interest of the Institute staff has been the leadership that can be provided by administrative teams. In the 1960s the Institute conducted three annual conferences that involved the same participants over a three-year period. Participants in the conferences were presidents and four or five other administrators whom each president regarded as members of his administrative team, council, or cabinet. The success of these conferences led to other funded projects in which the Institute staff worked concurrently with administrative teams from ten to twelve colleges at a time.

The development of administrative teams within a context of interinstitutional cooperation can be facilitated substantially by using well constructed simulation/gaming exercises. When administrative teams from

different campuses can participate in simulations that require group decision making, problem solving, or consensus building, the benefits are significant. Given the competitive challenge that is inherent in simulation/gaming, there are many benefits from learning situations in which team development is the major objective and group competition is an added incentive. Other advantages are found in the competitive conditions and mutual criticisms that follow from each team's solutions, decisions, or plans. As a result, team development can be fostered in a situation involving the acquisition of interpersonal skills while engaged in spirited competition between groups.

Simulation/gaming can be most effective in team development when three or four administrative teams can fashion different solutions or decisions — and then constructively criticize each team's work. Spotlights on individual contributions are dimmed and insights into team performance or productivity can be gained. In many respects, the postmortems of administrative teams in simulation/gaming may be the most instructive feature of the entire exercise.

The individual benefits of administrative team building are not always appreciated. Implicit in many efforts is an opportunity to test ideas, concepts, principles, and possibilities in an environment of professional collegiality. A major advantage, for better or worse, is the knowledge of results (feedback) that can be used by individual team members for the improvement of administrative performance.

Continuing Professional Education

The advantages, benefits, and effectiveness of inservice training, administrative development seminars, and continuing professional education can be seen in an administrative development program for minority faculty members in the University System of Georgia. To an appreciable extent, this particular program demonstrates the effective combination of formal seminars, informal workshops, administrative internships, intercampus visits, simulation/gaming exercises, and summative evaluation. The program was conducted for three years (1984-1987) and involved 26 participants (Regents Administrative Fellows), 18 of the 34 institutions in a statewide system of public higher education, the central staff of the Board of Regents, and the staff of the Institute of Higher Education.

In many respects, the Regents Administrative Development Program displays interinstitutional cooperation at its best. The various phases of the program are described briefly:

1. The principal instructional phase of the program was a two-weeks administrative development seminar conducted at the beginning of the academic year. The subject matter included institutional organization and governance, administrative roles and functions, financing and budgeting, planning concepts and methods, team development, faculty evaluation, and critical issues in higher education. Each participant used a textbook (Allan Tucker's *Chairing the Academic Department*) and training manual that included copies of all slides and transparencies used, as well as additional readings. Although all participants had earned doctorates, each could receive two-hours of graduate credit by enrolling for the seminar.

2. In an informal but highly effective workshop, three experienced administrators openly discussed all questions or issues introduced by the participants. The workshop had no agenda other than to provide an opportunity for a candid discussion between experienced and potential administrative leaders.

3. An administrative internship included the reassignment of each faculty/participant to a top-level administrator who supervised the intern's oncampus activities from September through May. Most participants were assigned to administrators on other campuses, but in a few cases participants were assigned to other administrators on their own campuses. Each participant received funds for reimbursement of relocation and travel expenses.

4. Intercampus visits (to each other's campuses), interviews with members of the Regents' central staff (including the Chancellor), attendance at a full meeting of the Board of Regents, a meeting of the advisory council of USGA presidents, and national or regional conferences were interspersed activities during the academic year. Each was a valuable learning experience for the participating fellows.

5. A highly instructive feature of the program was participation in a two-day simulation/gaming exercise. Participants were assigned administrative roles on one of two administrative teams in competition for a special program to be approved by the Board of Regents. To assist in preparing the proposal, each team was assigned an outside consultant and each president was assigned two assistants (graduate students in higher education). On the second day, each team presented its proposal to a "special panel" convened by the Regents. Each presentation was video-taped for later viewing by all participants.

6. The most valuable feature of the program may have been a one-week seminar in which each Regents Fellow prepared and then presented a formal report on the administrative internship in which he or she had participated. Each report was video-taped and then rated (in confidence) by the other participants. Following each formal report, an informal discussion dealt with each person's internship in depth. After making a formal report on his or her activities during the year, discussing those activities with nine other participants, and taking part in the discussion of nine other year-long fellowships, each Regents Fellow then completed a detailed evaluation of his or particular experiences and their value to professional and personal development.

In short, the Regents Administrative Development Program was a well organized and well funded three-year project that permitted the Institute staff to apply and use what we had learned from twenty years of planning and organizing conferences, seminars, workshops, internships, and graduate courses dealing with administrative leadership. An important (and gratifying) outcome of the program was what we learned in working with participating colleagues and cooperating institutions.

Intercultural Cooperation

Professional experiences, such as those described here, clearly imply their adaptability to other institutions and participants. There are many reasons, therefore, to believe that seminars, workshops, and conferences can be an effective means of intercultural cooperation in the education and development of institutional leaders — much as they have proven

to be effective ways in which scholarly and professional disciplines can communicate across national borders and cultural barriers.

On various occasions Institute programs have involved administrators who were visiting the U.S. to learn more about American higher education, administration and governance, and curricular or instructional improvement. From these experiences we have learned that the University System of Georgia, as a statewide system of public higher education, is a very convenient "instructional unit" by which to introduce international colleagues to American higher education. In return, each of these occasions has given us an opportunity to learn about institutional leadership in other nations.

A highly promising way in which European and American universities can cooperate is through visiting administrators who also conduct seminars in comparative higher education. This form of international cooperation readily lends itself to short-term instruction and consultation, as well as special seminars or lectures dealing with the similarities and differences of universities in the European Community and the United States. This kind of cooperative effort could be extended to include two or more administrators with complementary interests and expertise. Opportunities to observe and study administrative leadership would thereby be enhanced and the mutual benefits to hosts and visitors would be greatly increased. With experience, other forms of intercultural cooperation could follow: interinstitutional exchanges in which administrative teams from European and American universities could observe and study institutional leadership in other cultural settings. In such ways, all would be involved in the continuing professional education of administrative leaders with many mutual benefits.

Currently under consideration is a cooperative agreement between the Institute of Higher Education and De Montfort University (formerly Leicester Polytechnic). Under this agreement the Institute will invite two or three administrators to the University of Georgia where they will interview and consult experienced vice presidents, deans, directors, and department heads about administrative concepts and practices. Prior to their visits, the administrators will receive advance readings dealing with institutional organization, governance, and administration. During their visits, intercampus trips will be arranged with other institutions, and informal conferences will be held on various administrative matters.

While observing and studying administrative practices at a representative research/graduate/land grant university, visiting lecturers will conduct seminars on the problems and issues of higher education in their own country and on administrative matters within their home institution. In addition, they may give one or two lectures on European higher education and the relevance of international cooperation to larger audiences within the university community. The length of each visit would be at least two weeks, and the number of visits will be two, three, or four depending on institutional commitments at the time. It is anticipated that at least six visiting administrators will participate during the 1992-1993 academic year.

The expected outcomes of such cooperation are commendable. In return for instruction and consultation on administrative leadership, the Institute staff and its doctoral students will learn more about higher education in other countries. The University of Georgia will be better informed about the opportunities for international cooperation, and a precedent will have been set for other cooperative programs involving administrative leaders.

Conclusions and Implications

This paper has considered the various ways in which cooperative relations among universities can be established for the dual purposes of educating and developing administrative leadership *and* enhancing institutional effectiveness through intercultural cooperation. Several cooperative strategies have been suggested by the author's experience in organizing conferences, seminars, workshops, and graduate courses dealing with administrative leadership.

The primary emphasis in this paper has been placed on administrative development seminars in which instructional strategies play a dominant role. Recommendations are made with full awareness of collegial skepticism concerning instructional (or didactic) methods of fostering leadership. With or without skepticism, inservice development workshops, seminars, and conferences are the most readily available means (in higher education) to address a continuing need for better prepared administrators. Given the conventional means by which academic administrators are recruited, selected, and appointed, there is little likelihood that

doctoral programs of higher education will supply the majority of institutional leaders in the foreseeable future.

Whatever direction the education and development of administrative leaders may take in the next few years, there are excellent reasons to believe that strategies and programs will be more effective when they involve two or more institutions in cooperative efforts to solve common problems and to address mutual interests. And given the many challenges with which universities are confronted, the concerted education and development of administrative leaders would be a wise long-term investment of institutional resources and talents. Many administrators willingly learn from their distant peers what they cannot learn from oncampus colleagues.

In all instructional and developmental efforts there should be opportunities to learn more about institutions of higher learning and the leadership they will require in the years ahead. Intellectual substance and content should not be lacking from administrative development seminars, and no apologies should be made for a lack of entertainment. In brief, the advantages and benefits of administrative development seminars are numerous, but their effectiveness is dependent upon conditions and procedures that must be well planned and implemented.

In precisely the same manner, the education and development of administrative leaders must give more emphasis to the international and intercultural contexts in which universities now function. For such reasons, a general and particular emphasis has been placed on intercultural cooperation as an essential component in the education of future leadership. In devising cooperative strategies for the training and development of administrative leaders, it should go without saying that creative, innovative approaches are needed. In this respect, the possibilities for administrative development seminars, international conferences, and intercultural cooperation are innumerable — and challenging.

References

Bass, Bernard M. *Bass & Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research, and Managerial Applications* (3rd ed.). New York: The Free Press, 1990.

Bolman, Lee G. & Deal, Terrence E. *Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice, and Leadership.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1991.

Conger, Jay A. et al. *Charismatic Leadership: The Elusive Factor in Organizational Effectiveness.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1988.

Fincher, Cameron. "Planning for Quality and Efficiency in Higher Education." Presented at the 6th European AIR Forum in Brussels and published in Charles H. Belanger (Ed.), *Beyond Retrenchment: Planning for Quality and Efficiency.* 1984.

Fincher, Cameron. "Administrative Leadership in Higher Education." In John Smart (Ed.) *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research. Volume III.* New York: Agathon Press, 1987a.

Fincher, Cameron. "University-Government Relations and Academic Organization." Presented at the 9th EAIR Forum in Enschede and published in L.C.J. Goedegebuure and V.L. Meek (Eds.), *Change in Higher Education: The Non-University Sector,* 1987b.

Fincher, Cameron. "The Influence of British and German Universities on the Historical Development of State Universities in the U.S. and Their Reciprocal Influences Since WWII." Paper presented at the 11th EAIR Forum at the University of Trier, Germany, 1989.

Fincher, Cameron. "Administrative and Organizational Structures in American, British, and Continental Universities." Paper presented (by Larry G. Jones) at the 1991 EAIR Conference in Edinburgh.

Green, Madeleine F. (Ed.). *Leaders for a New Era: Strategies for Higher Education.* New York: Macmillan, 1988.

Green, Madeleine and McDade, Sharon. *Investing in Higher Education: A Handbook of Leadership Development.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1991.

Koestenbaum, Peter. *Leadership: The Inner Side of Greatness.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1991.

Korn/Ferry International and Columbia University Graduate Business School. "Reinventing the CEO: 21st Century Report." (Cited in *Training and Development Journal*, January 1990).

Kouzes, James M. and Posner, Barry Z. *The Leadership Challenge: How to Get Extraordinary Things Done in Organizations.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1989.

Moore, Kathryn M. "Administrative Pathways to Leadership Positions." In Madeleine F. Green (Ed.), *Leaders for a New Era: Strategies for Higher Education.* New York: ACE/Macmillan, 1988.

Porter, Lyman W. and McKibbin, Lawrence E. *Management Education and Development: Drift or Thrust into the 21st Century.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1988.

Purpose and Functions

The Institute of Higher Education is a service, instructional, and research agency of the University of Georgia. Established in 1964, the Institute cooperates with other agencies and institutions in the development of higher education. Programs and services help prepare professionally trained personnel in higher education, assist other colleges and universities in numerous ways, and study the organizational and functional processes of institutions and programs of higher education.

Publications

The Institute publishes a series of occasional papers, monographs, and newsletters dealing with selected topics in higher education. The general purpose of Institute publications is to inform administrators and faculty members of recent trends and developments in areas such as administration, curriculum planning, program evaluation, professional development, and teaching effectiveness. The specific intent may be to report research findings, to interpret general trends or recent events, or to suggest new lines of inquiry into various problems.

Additional copies of this publication may be obtained from:

Institute of Higher Education
Candler Hall
The University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30602-1772
706/542-3464